

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over PCT Publication WO 03/034596 to Coene ("Coene") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,116,626 to Woods ("Woods"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2 are allowable over Coene in view of Woods.

Coene shows a lattice of data bits (see, FIG. 2A) wherein rows of data bits are not horizontally overlapping. In fact not of Coene shows a horizontally overlapping lattice of data bits in a holographic medium.

It is respectfully submitted that the device of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Coene in view of Woods. For example, Coene in view of Woods does not disclose or suggest, a device that amongst other patentable elements, comprises


(illustrative emphasis provided) "[a]n optical holographic device for reading out a data page of a holographic medium, said data page having a staggered structure of data bits that are horizontally overlapping such that a first row of data bits horizontally overlaps a next succeeding row of data bits" as recited in claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over Coene in view of Woods and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and accordingly is allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicant has made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
April 14, 2008

Enclosures: Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101